DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 606 CS 508 778

AUTHOR Barnes, Judith A.; And Others
TITLE Do We Have a Problem Here? English Teachers and Required Integration of the Language Arts in California High Schools: A Survey of the Status of Speech Communication as Taught by English Teachers.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Communication Skills; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *English Instruction; High Schools; *Speech Communication; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *California; English Teachers; *Speech Communication Education; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study of 178 secondary school teachers in the California was motivated by the passage of the Ryan Act of 1970, which eliminated the high school speech credential and subsumed it under the English umbrella. The result has been that the speech communication subject matter is expected to be integrated into the English courses in the state. The 1987 state curriculum standards requiring integration of the language arts specifically state that oral communication and listening are to be taught in a number of ways in English courses. Two research questions were posed: (1) Would post-Ryan Act English teachers be more likely to integrate oral communication into their English courses? and (2) Are there any demographic predictors of the extent to which an English teacher would integrate oral communication in his or her classroom? Results showed that only 20% of the respondents could give a specific technique or example of how they taught speech or listening in the classroom. Generally, there is no difference between pre- and post-Ryan Act English teachers' handling of speech in their curriculums, which gives further support to Post-Ryan English teachers' not being prepared adequately to teacher speech communication in "process/theory" areas. Regarding demographics, results showed that female teachers were more likely to teach communication skills than male teachers. Speech communication educators must get the national and state offices of education to accept the importance of their discipline in secondary schools. (Contains 17 references and a table of data.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 606

Do We Have A Problem Here? English Teachers and Required Integration of the Language Arts in California High Schools: A Survey of the Status of Speech Communication as Taught by English Teachers

by

Judith A. Barnes, Ph.D.
Department of Communication Studies
Teacher Education
San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0112

Joan Bodeman
T.A. and graduate student
Department of Communication Studies
San Jose State University

Andrew F. Hayes
T.A. and Ph.D. candidate
Department of Psychology
Cornell University

University clearance for use of human subjects was received. Social Science Foundation Grant # 55-1605-1001 funded the costs of training, contact telephone calls, follow-up interview telephone calls, and materials.

CS508778

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Barnes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

What *i s* the status of the teaching of oral communication in the secondary schools? National and state examinations have continued to explore this question, usually concluding that our schools are failing to provide substantive instruction which would allow students to develop the ability to use language, to think and to communicate effectively in the many situations that will demand this expertise. There is a new groundswell with the advent of Education 2000 to once again investigate needs for improvement in this area.

This survey was motivated by the changes in the secondary teacher credentialing process in the State of California that eliminated the high school speech credential and subsumed it under the English "umbrella." (Ryan Act, 1970.) The result has been that the speech communication subject matter is expected to be integrated into the English courses in the state. The 1987 state curriculum standards requiring integration of the language arts specifically state that oral communication and listening be taught in a number of ways in English courses. It was thought to be unlikely that English teachers were qualified to teach oral communication in the manner specified by the curriculum standards because the California preparation standards for English teachers did not require coursework in speech communication departments. This survey was designed based on the state curriculum standards (1987) to see if English teachers (who outnumber specialized speech teachers 400 to 1) are integrating speech communication subject matter as required. A stratified random sample of English teachers was surveyed. Results indicate that these teachers are not meeting the curriculum standards of integration of oral communication and listening with literature and writing. Speech communication educators are encouraged to get involved at the state and national levels to insure that preparation standards for English teachers include required courses in speech communication and/or that a speech course be required in the secondary schools.

**A Survey of High School English Teachers in California:
An Examination of the Effects of the Ryan Act and
Integration of Language Arts
on Instruction of Oral Communication**

What *is* the status of the teaching of oral communication in the secondary schools? For most of our nations' youth, elementary and secondary schools represent their only opportunity for formal communication training. Specifically, 63% of students complete only 4 years of high school or less (U.S. department of statistics, 1989.) When establishing educational goals the National Governors' Association (1990) concluded that ".....all of our people will need to be able to communicate complex ideas." The SCA Rationale Kit (1989) emphasis communicates the importance of speech communication instruction as argued by economic, political, and education leaders. The 1989 SCA president, Gustav W. Friedrich begins this rationale kit with a the reminder that .."true education requires interdisciplinary cooperation for the development of such essentials as the ability to use language, to think, and to communicate effectively; to use mathematical knowledge and methods to solve problems; to reason logically;...to understand other languages and cultures..." In this regard, many examinations have continued to conclude that our schools are failing to provide substantive instruction which would allow students to understand the ever-changing oral communication process which continues to evolve as they mature and develop. Consequentially, schools are not preparing students to communicate effectively in their family and relationships, in the workplace or in their world as concerned citizens. (See for example, Backlund et. al, 1982; Gray, 1982; Boileau & McBath, 1987; Poulakos, 1989; Rubin, 1988, 1990; and Arliss, 1992.) Yet, the efforts in the field of speech communication to get the national and state offices of education to

recognize and accept the importance of speech communication education in the secondary schools have not been very effective.

The attention of numerous Speech Communication scholars and both state and national organizations to the paucity of adequate speech communication representation in our schools led to the development of K-12 curriculum guidelines (see for example CSCA, 1989, 1990; SCA, 1991, CHSSA, 1992). Excellence in the development of these guidelines and in the findings of task forces concerned with this issue means we as a field are prepared to present qualitatively what is needed in speech communication education on all levels. It is the opinion of the authors of the research reported herein, that our quantitative results gives our field additional justification for demanding corrections in the preparation standards that presently do not provide adequate, if any, representation in K-12 education.

In California, with the issuing of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 (the Ryan Act), an attempt to streamline the credentialing process reduced the number of total single subject credentials to thirteen. The speech communication discipline was placed under the English "umbrella", resulting in an English/Speech subject matter program for Speech majors which required anywhere from 18-30 units in English in additional to the B.A. in speech. This led to a diminished number of specialized speech teachers in California high schools. The stratified random sample used in the research reported herein, revealed that the current ratio of credentialed English High School teachers to Speech/English emphasis teachers is 400 to 1. It therefore became clear that our field was going to be dependent primarily on the English teachers, to receive adequate representation in California High Schools. According to Vangelisti (1989) the majority of state departments of education have included oral communication training within a broad set of language arts objectives which has focused predominantly upon reading and writing.

For example, the newly published California English Teacher Preparation Standards (1993) still do not stipulate that all English Subject Matter preparation programs

require oral communication courses taught by speech communication experts, even though the state curriculum standards mandate integration of all four Language Arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening.) The resulting confusion from having **Curriculum** standards that specify the integration of all four Language Arts, (*California Model Curriculum Standards for English-Language Arts 9-12*) and not having specific California State English teacher **Preparation** Standards to adequately train English teachers to meet those curriculum standards, was what initially motivated this exploratory survey research.

Following the Ryan Act revisions, it has been unclear exactly how much formal preparation in speech communication most English teachers were receiving in the teacher preparation programs around the state. A survey of the California State University programs (Barnes 1992) indicates that English credential programs do not include even basic course preparation in speech communication to assure that English teachers could effectively integrate speaking and listening into the language arts curriculum. It has been further ascertained by the authors of this research, in discussions with the CTC (Commission on Teaching Credentialing) in the state education department, that most California programs for credentialing English teachers are extremely heavy on the Literature requirements and many require no coursework outside the English department at all. It should be noted that the CTC said that no representative from speech communication was nominated to be seated on English single subject advisory panels which met from 1989-1991 to make these preparation decisions. The California State Speech association (CSCA) is presently making progress to assure that subsequent advisory panels in 1997-99 will have nominations representing our field.

This survey of California English Teachers was designed to answer the question: "What is actually being taught by High School English teachers in the State of California and are they including speech communication content in their English courses as instructed by the 1987 Language Arts Curriculum Framework ? This survey research therefore, is an

answer to calls to examine the effects of the Ryan Act and the ensuing integration of the Language Arts on instruction in oral communication in California secondary schools.

R1: Would post-Ryan Act English teachers be more likely to integrate oral communication into their English courses?

R2: Are there any demographic predictors of the extent to which an English teacher teaches oral communication in his or her classroom?

Method

Participants

A random sample of 400 California high school English teachers (out of 8068), stratified by size of school enrollment, was obtained from a professional sampling company.[1] The stratification was based on the population of 20% small enrollment schools (less than 500 students), 40% moderate enrollment (between 500 and 999 students) and 40% high enrollment schools (enrollment of 1000 or more). The sampling company provided the names and phone numbers of teachers selected from the population. Of the 400 provided, 200 were randomly selected to be interviewed over the phone. If a teacher refused to participate or contact could not be made after 5 attempts, a new teacher was selected randomly from the remaining 200. Due to uncodable responses, misunderstandings of the survey questions, or other procedural difficulties, some of the respondents were discarded from the sample. The final sample submitted for analysis thus consisted of 178 teachers. The size of the final strata roughly mirrored the population (19.7%, 38.8%, 41.6%). The interviewed teachers who provided usable data were 60% female, with a mean age of 44.9 years ($\underline{s}$ = 8.77) and had been teaching an average of 18 years ($\underline{s}$ = 8.83).

Instrument Design

A combination fixed and open-response questionnaire was designed to parallel the curriculum standards adopted by the California State Board of Education (1985). Each standard that related to the teaching of speech communication subject matter was given at least one question on the survey. The questionnaire included dichotomous yes/no items as

well as scales along which teachers were to indicate the extent to which they employ such procedures in their classrooms.[2]

The questionnaire included 6 forced-choice questions to which the interviewees would respond yes or no: (1) Do you utilize activities to integrate writing, speaking, and listening in your classroom? (2) Do you have your students give oral presentations? (3) Do you teach listening skills? (4) Do you teach techniques of persuasion/propaganda? (5) Do you teach vocabulary? and (6) Do you have a speech team? Fourteen questions required interviewees to respond on a 4-point scale where 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = often, 4 = very often. A "don't know" response was also permitted. These questions included: How often do you use [classroom discussion/small group discussion/group presentations/debate] for examining [public issues/literature] (8 questions); How often do you teach the following interpersonal communication skills?: Conflict resolution, interpersonal communication, active listening, family communication, knowledge of self, nonverbal communication (6 questions). Four questions required respondents to rate how important the following subjects were in structuring their curriculum on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 = very important and 10 = not at all important (a "don't know" response was also permitted): Cultural diversity, English as a second language, ethnicity awareness, and intercultural communication. Though not directly related to any specific curriculum standard, one final question asked interviewees whether or not they taught theory of communication. Finally, a number of demographic questions (specifically: age, gender, education of the teacher, salary, socioeconomic status and ethnicity) were included in the survey. Some of the questions also allowed for an open-format response where specific details about teaching techniques could be obtained if the interviewee was willing or able to provide this information.

Interview Process

The team of 12 interviewers (graduate and undergraduate speech majors) were selected by the faculty project director after individual interviews. Selection was based on

previous exposure to interview surveying and logistic considerations. The selected interviewers were given course credit for their participation in the project. After participating in the designing and piloting of the questionnaire and following rigorous training, each interviewer contacted a subset of the sampled teachers through the phone number provided by the sampling company. The interviewees were told that they had been selected to participate in study on the "teaching of communication skills within the Language Arts departments in California high schools" and that if they agreed to participate, their responses would remain confidential. After the 20 to 25 minute interview, each respondent was allowed to indicate whether or not they wished a copy of the final results and were thanked for their participation.

Results

The proportion of respondents who answered each question in a particular way (e.g. Often, Never) are listed in Table 1. These results provide information about the extent to which English teachers on the whole are teaching oral communication in their classrooms. Three questions (1, 8, 9, as designated in Table 1) were followed by an open-format response request for sample techniques if the respondent answered "yes" to the question. Only 20% actually were able to provide a technique and of those who did, only 5% actually gave a technique which justified their "yes" response.

One question on the survey asked interviewees the year they received their credential. Teachers credentialed prior to 1972 were classified as the "pre-Ryan" teachers (n= 74) while the remaining teachers were classified as "post-Ryan" (n = 98). Six interviewees didn't respond to this question. The year 1972 was selected as an appropriate year to divide the sample because while the Ryan Act was passed in 1970, most credential programs take about 2 years and students already in a credential program when the Ryan Act was passed were allowed to fulfill the pre-Ryan requirements. An additional variable was created to reflect the level of education obtained by each teacher. In the interview, respondents were asked to report the degrees they held. Teachers possessing a graduate-

level degree (Masters or Doctorate) were classified as graduate-level teachers, all others as non-graduate teachers. A final income variable reflecting the socioeconomic status of the community where the teacher was employed was created by consulting the 1990 census for the median income associated with the postal zip code in which the school resided.

All dichotomous-response questions were analyzed with hierarchical logistic regression while the remaining questions were analyzed with ordinary least-squares hierarchical regression, using listwise case deletion to remove subjects with incomplete data on the response or demographic covariates (usually around 25 respondents). Each response variable was first regressed on level of education of the teacher, gender, SES of the district, and enrollment size of the school (entered as a 3-level factor). Next, the dummy-coded credential period of the teacher (0 = pre-Ryan, 1 = post-Ryan) was entered into the model to see if any additional variance could be explained by this variable after adjusting for the demographic variables. This procedure essentially produces a test for differences between the credential groups on the response variable, controlling for the demographic characteristics. Finally, whenever a significant relationship between credential period and the response was found, further tests for interactions between credential period and the demographic characteristics were conducted. Because of the nonnormality of the conditional errors, responses to the 10-point questions were transformed by taking the natural logarithm of the response.

Of the 24 tests conducted examining the relationship between credential period and teaching of communication skills, controlling for the assorted demographic variables, significant differences between the groups were discovered on only 2 of the measures. Post-Ryan teachers were more likely than pre-Ryan teachers to report utilizing activities to integrate writing, speaking, and listening; change in deviance $\chi^2(1) = 11.58$, $p < .001$. All but 8 of the teachers responded "yes" to this question. However, those 8 that did not were all credentialed prior to 1972. Post-Ryan teachers were also more likely than pre-Ryan teachers to report requiring their students to give oral presentations; change in deviance

$\chi^2(1) = 3.90$, $p < .05$. The estimated regression slope of -1.33 (s.e. = 0.71) translates into an odds ratio of 3.81, indicating that Post-Ryan teachers were nearly 4 times more likely to respond "yes" to this question. There were also 2 marginally significant effects: Post-Ryan teachers reported using classroom discussion [b = -0.24, s.e. = 0.15, t (148) = -1.68, $p < .10$] and small group discussion [b = -0.29, s.e. = 0.16, t (148) = -1.88, $p < .07$] to examine public issues more often than pre-Ryan teachers to a marginally significant degree. Period of credential did not interact with any of the demographic characteristics in the tests reported above. No other significant credential effects were found. The mean responses to each question as well as the means for each credential group, adjusted for the relationship between the response and the demographic variables, are listed in Table 1. (attached)

Teaching of theory. To assess the extent to which a teacher emphasizes communication theory in the lesson plan, 12 questions were aggregated to create a theory scale. The questions that were used to construct this scale are superscripted in Table 1 with the letter "t". Each interviewee's response for each of the 12 questions was converted to a standard normal deviate (z-score) and these normal deviates were added together. Thus, each question was given equal weight in constructing the scale. The internal consistency of the scale was acceptably high, as measured by Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .81$).

This theory score was simultaneously regressed on the teacher's credential period as well as the demographic variables used in the above analysis. No significant differences between pre and post-Ryan teachers were discovered in the teaching of communication theory, nor was the teaching of theory significantly related to any of the demographic variables.

Demographic predictors

A secondary purpose of this investigation was to determine if there are demographic predictors of the extent to which a teacher teaches oral communication skills in his or her classroom. Several interesting findings, obtained from the final model of the regressions

reported above, were discovered. Thus, the findings reported below are partial relationships, adjusted for the other demographic variables as well as credential period. Because of the large number of analyses conducted, only relationships significant at $p < .01$ are reported.

Gender. Sex of the interviewer was significantly related to six of the responses. Females reported that they used small group discussion [b = -0.46, s.e. = 0.15, t (148) = -3.12, p < .01] and group presentations [b = -0.48, s.e. = 0.15, t (148) = -3.22, p < .01] more often in their classrooms than did males. Females also reported teaching conflict resolution [b = -0.50, s.e. = 0.18, t (146) = -2.79, p < .01] and family communication [b = -0.42, s.e. = 0.15, t (146) = -2.82, p < .01] more frequently than did males. Finally, females rated ethnicity awareness and intercultural communication as more important in structuring their language arts curriculum than did males [b = -0.31, s.e. = .11, t (144) = -2.79, p < .01; b = -0.34, s.e. = 0.11, t (144) = -2.94, p < .003, respectively].

Education of the teacher. Whether or not the teacher possessed a graduate-level degree was not significantly related to their responses to any of the questions.

Enrollment. The number of students enrolled at the school was entered into the regression as a three-level factor with small enrollment schools as the reference category. Thus all effects reported below are relative to small schools.

Teachers instructing in both medium and the large enrollment schools reported using classroom discussion more often when teaching literature [b = -0.62, s.e. = 0.16, t (148) = -3.85, p < .001 for medium schools; b = -0.62, s.e. = 0.16, t (148) = -3.80, p < .001 for large schools]. Teachers instructing at large schools also reported that cultural diversity and English as a second language was more important in structuring their language arts curriculum [b = -0.40, s.e. = 0.15, t (148) = 2.59, p < .01; b = -0.62, s.e. = 0.18, t (127) = -3.43, p < .001, respectively].

Socioeconomic status. The SES of the district where the teacher instructed was related to only one response. As the income of the district increased, the rated importance

of English as a second language was rated as decreasingly important in the structuring of the language arts curriculum [b = .00001, s.e. = 0.0000035, t (127) = 2.81, p < .007].

DISCUSSION

Demographics:

We found the demographics to be quite interesting in themselves. The gender of English teachers is relatively equal but the responses are different (see discussion of gender below.) The finding that over 90% of the English teachers surveyed are European/ Caucasian and nearly 70% are over 40 years of age, may explain the responses that only slightly more that half the English teachers consider Ethnicity Awareness when structuring their language arts curriculum, and less than one fourth considered ESL (English as a second language) as important in structuring their curriculum. The newest CTC 1993 preparation standards include requirements that all subject matter programs must include some intercultural courses and ESL training to meet the diverse backgrounds of California students.

It also occurred to the authors that the age demographics indicate increasing retirement possibilities which may give the speech communication field an opportunity to make the necessary changes in the preparation process to ensure that future English teachers will be properly trained in oral communication. Increased retirement may also change the ethnic makeup of high school English departments, most likely including the addition of more diverse ethnic representation.

Open Ended Response Questions

Although over 95% of the English teachers responding "yes" to the question regarding the integration of oral and listening skills in their English courses, only 20% gave examples of how they do this in the open-ended part of the question. The examples given rarely exemplified a clear grasp of the subject matter in these areas. It was interesting that over 40% refused to give an example at all and 37% actually said they "don't know" of an

example. We believe this illustrates the confusion about what "integrating" the Language Arts actually means.

California curriculum standard #15 specifically states "Students regularly take part in discussions, panels, and debates on worthwhile topics" The English teacher's responses to related questions in our survey indicated that with the exception of small group discussion, this is not being done in English classes. The concern is that here again, speech communication opportunities are not being offered to students. It is also disturbing that debate receives so little attention in examining public issues when it lends itself so easily to this area. There are also very creative ways to use debate to teach literature. The state Curriculum Standards even offer suggestions of how to use oral exercises to teach these areas. (for example "...suggested list of speeches can be taught partly through prepared oral presentations by students, and "... teachers draw from these (issues) for discussion and debate topics"; "...students conceive, develop, organize and express ideas effectively in order to present their views on student rights in a panel discussion; "....students present a mock TV newscast.")

The authors were shocked to have only 3% of the respondents willing to give an example of a technique they use to teach listening skills. The techniques given were primarily indirect techniques (e.g. testing over material), yet standard # 19 states clearly "Listening skills require direct teaching." Several other of the curriculum standards refer to the importance of teaching listening and integration of oral/aural activities into the teaching of literature. Always, specific examples are given with the standards to assist in achieving the standards leaving us to speculate that the negligence in in the preparation standards.

Standard # 20 states "Students apply higher level thinking such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation as they detect propaganda techniques." This standard is clearly based on *Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives,* which all teachers are exposed to several times in their training. Only 50% of the respondents reported that they teach

propaganda and the techniques they reported in open-ended responses seldom tapped these higher level thinking categories. Most were related to persuasion in media advertising.

Results showed that over 80% of the English teachers "infrequently use" or "do not use" student speeches to teach vocabulary. Since standard #23 states "Vocabulary teaching should be part of teaching speech and writing as well as comprehension activities." we again speculated that teachers were not being prepared to incorporate representative activity suggestions in the standards such as "...in learning persuasive speaking, students identify persuasive words in advertisements, brochures, and political speeches."

Research Question #1

Because of the emphasis by the state of California on Post-Ryan English teachers to integrate the Language Arts, it was considered that they might reveal significantly different responses from Pre-Ryan teachers. The results do indicate that Post-Ryan English teachers are more likely to report that they use oral communication in the classroom than Pre-Ryan teachers but the lack of volunteered examples and type of examples given in the open-format responses show limited understanding of the meaning of "oral communication", "listening" and "propaganda." It is probable that this result can better be explained by the Post-Ryan teachers' familiarity with curriculum terminology of integration of the Language Arts than any clear understanding of the concepts and principles required to actually do the integration of speech communication subject matter. Mastering oral communication requires that we understand the process. The 12 questions aggregated to create a theory scale showed no significance between Pre and Post-Ryan teachers, (subscripted in table I with the letter "t") giving further support to Post-Ryan English teachers not being prepared to adequately teach speech communication "process/theory" areas. Accordingly, we conclude that California high schools are failing to provide substantive theory instruction which would allow students to understand the use of oral communication in their lives.

Research question #2

The results regarding demographic predictors were interesting. Females were more likely than males to report that they were teaching or concerned about speech communication subject matter areas in their curriculum. This suggests a frequently observed phenomena in genderspeak articles and books (see for example Haden, 1993) that women in the Western cultures may be more interested in communication than men. Graduate programs in English apparently do not provide any more preparation in speech communication than do undergraduate programs since having a graduate degree was not significantly related to any responses. The lack of socioeconomic predictors was disappointing.

Future Study questions: Survey II

We have explained these discouraging findings as due to the inadequate training of English teachers. Without an adequate control group of teachers who are required to teach the same material and yet have different training, our claim is admittedly speculative. A second study is currently underway to provide better evidence that high school English teachers who receive little if any speech communication training during their credentialing are poorly prepared to integrate the language arts and teach communication skills to their students. In this study, the responses to these same questions will be obtained from teachers who focused their training during credentialing on speech communication as well as the requisite English courses. We believe that such training better prepares potential high school English instructors to integrate the language arts and thus they will be more likely to report teaching what the state standards explicitly require them to teach. If so, these combined results will present an interesting case to the state that they must either make key adjustments to English teacher preparation standards issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to insure that the mandated communication skills are indeed adequately integrated into the literature-based language arts framework, or require an oral

communication course as one semester of the eight required semesters of language arts in the California high schools.

Conclusions and Recommendations

It becomes necessary for us to intensify commendable efforts of the past to get the national and state offices of education to recognize our associations' curriculum and preparation recommendations, and accept the importance of speech communication education in the secondary schools. The California State speech association (CSCA) has already made inroads to assure future participation by having representatives from various related departments of education at annual conferences. One of the authors has been nominated by the state association to serve on the 1994-95 CTC review panels for approving all English credential programs. It is anticipated that the results of this Survey I (of English teachers) and the Survey II (of California Speech Teachers) currently being conducted, will accompany an appeal to the State of California to recognize that oral competence is not being achieved as mandated by the state. The appeal will stress that the State must either make key adjustments to English teacher preparation standards issued by the CTC, to insure that the mandated communication skills are indeed adequately integrated into the literature-based language arts framework, or require an oral communication course as one semester of the eight required semesters of Language Arts in California high schools.

It is important to note that the English teachers themselves are not the target of this survey and ensuing evaluation. "Even those educators who recognize the importance of oral communication in the development and enhancement of their students' reading, writing, and problem-solving skills do not have the expertise to implement effective oral communication programs, nor do they realize speech communication experts exist to assist them." (Del Polito, 1980)

In all, training in oral communication remains one of the most neglected of the basic skills. Ideally, the development of oral communication skills should be stressed across the

curriculum beginning in elementary school. Solving problems in social studies through small group discussions, reporting orally on the results of science experiments, dramatizing stories from children's literature, privately expressing one's thoughts and feelings during the writing conference, reading literature aloud and talking through mathematical problems with others. We as concerned educators are going to have to get politically involved in the state and national education issues related to preparation of teachers in order to make these changes. We are a small field speaking well (with apologies to Quintilian) but we are not communicating to the places where the changes are made. Current attention from SCA to national education programs like Education 2000 is an example of getting involved in creating community and can increase our involvement in making these changes.

References

Arliss, L. (1992). The status of oral communication instruction In New York state secondary schools. Network. p. 123-131.

Backlund,P.,Booth, J., Moore, M, Parks, J.M., & VanRheenen, D. (1982). A national survey of state practices in speaking and listening skill assessment. Communication Education, 31, 125-129.

Barnes, J. A. (1992, May). Are we teaching our students to communicate effectively?: A survey design. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Speech Communication Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Boileau, D.M., & McBath, J.H. (1987). The new basic: Oral communication. Updating School Board Policies, 18, No. 2.

Book, C., & Pappas, E. (1981) The Status of speech communication in secondary schools in the United States: An Update. Communication Education, 30, 199-208.

California State Board of Education (1985). Model curriculum standards, grades 9 through 12: English/Language Arts. Sacramento, CA.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing (1992). English teacher preparation in California: Standards of quality and effectiveness for subject matter programs. Dept. of Education, Sacramento, CA.

Gray, P.A. (1982). Basic oral communication skills and the State Speech Association. Communication Education, 31, 231-238.

Haden , S. (1993) Genderspeak John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

National Governors' Association, (1990). Educating America: State strategies for achieving the national education goals Washington D.C.: National Governors Association. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Peterson, K., Hadley, P. & Boileau, D.M. (1986) SCA Rationale Kit: Statements Supporting Speech Communication. Updated (1989) by Chesebro, J.W.

Poulakos, J. (1989). "The centrality of oral communication in secondary education" Keynote address for the convention of the Missouri Speech and Theater Assoc.

Rubin. R.B., & Graham, E.E. (1988) Communication coorelates of college success: An exploratory investigation. Communication Education, 37, 14 - 27.

Rubin, R.B., Graham, E.E. & Mignerey, J.T. (1990) A longitudinal study of college students' communication competence. Communication Education, 39, 1-13.

Speech Communication Association Task Force (1991). SCA guidelines for developing oral communication curricula in K-12 grades.

Vangelisti, A. L., & Daly, J. A. (1989). Correlates of speaking skills in the United States: A national assessment. Communication Education, 38, 132-143.

West, J. (1970). "Teacher preparation and licensing law of 1970" (The Ryan Act). Annotated California Codes, Ed. Code 44200-44295.

Footnotes

[1] Survey Sampling Inc., Fairfield, Connecticut.

[2] A copy of the questionnaire is available upon request from the first author.

Table 1. Interviewee responses to survey questions and adjusted[1] means for Pre and Post-Ryan Act English teachers.

		Response (%)		Adjusted % "YES"		
		YES	NO	Pre	Post	p
Q1:	Do you utilize activities to integrate writing, speaking, and listening?	94.9	4.5	89	100	.001
Q4:	Do you have your students give oral presentations?	91.0	7.9	87	97	.05
Q8:	Do you teach listening skills?	70.3	29.7	77	66	ns
Q9:	Do you teach techniques of Propaganda and/or Persuasion? [t]	50.4	49.4	57	50	ns
Q11:	Do you teach vocabulary?	91.6	8.4	93	85	ns
Q14:	Do you have a speech team?	35.4	62.9	35	33	ns
Q16:	Do you teach theory of communication? [t]	27.5	70.2	27	29	ns

---

Q2: To what extent do you use the following techniques for examining public issues? [t]

	Response (%)[2]					Adjusted mean		
	VO	O	Occ	N	Mean[3]	Pre	Post	p
Classroom Discussion	37.1	33.7	25.8	3.4	1.96	2.12	1.88	.10
Small Group Discussion	16.9	28.1	39.9	15.2	2.53	2.65	2.36	.07
Group Presentations	10.1	29.2	37.1	23.6	2.74	2.85	2.63	ns
Debate	6.7	7.9	41.0	43.8	3.23	3.33	3.21	ns

(Table continues)

Table 1. (continued)

Q3: To what extent to you use the following techniques for examining literature?

	VO	O	Occ	N	Mean	Pre	Post	p
Classroom Discussion	63.5	25.8	9.0	1.7	1.49	1.47	1.54	ns
Small Group Discussion	28.7	34.8	30.9	5.6	2.13	2.21	2.07	ns
Group Presentations	16.3	25.8	41.0	16.9	2.58	2.76	2.45	ns
Debate	7.9	6.2	38.8	46.6	3.25	3.28	3.24	ns

Q10: How often do you teach the following Interpersonal Communication skills? [t]

	VO	O	Occ	N	Mean	Pre	Post	p
Conflict Resolution	20.2	17.4	34.3	26.4	2.68	2.75	2.67	ns
Inter. Attraction/Intim. Comm	5.6	14.0	31.5	40.4	3.17	3.08	3.19	ns
Active Listening	32.0	28.1	27.0	11.8	2.19	2.14	2.32	ns
Family Communication	11.2	12.4	45.5	28.7	2.94	3.01	2.92	ns
Knowledge of Self	41.6	36.0	16.3	4.5	1.83	1.90	1.83	ns
Nonverbal Communication	14.0	15.7	44.9	23.6	2.79	2.80	2.76	ns

Q13: On a scale from 1 to 10, how important is each of the following topics in structuring your Language Arts curriculum? (1 = very important, 10 = not important)

		Adj. Log Mean		
	Median	Pre	Post	p
Cultural Diversity	3.00	0.92	0.90	ns
ESL	5.50	1.55	1.51	ns
Ethnicity Awareness	3.00	1.06	0.99	ns
Intercultural Communication	3.00	1.12	1.04	ns

(Table continues)

Table 1 (cont).

[1] Adjusted for relationship between response variable and demographic covariates.

[2] VO = Very often, O = Often, Occ = Occasionally, N = Never (n = 178)

[3] Means reflect quantifying responses as VO = 1, O = 2, Occ = 3, N = 4. Because of missing demographic data for some respondents, n was between 130 and 155 for tests of difference between the credential groups. Otherwise, n = 178.

[t] Question used in constructing communication theory index.